

REMARKS

Claims 1-35 are now pending in the application. Claims 30-35 are cancelled herein. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejection(s) in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 102

Claims 1-3, 9, 11-14, and 29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Suzuki et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,166,468). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to independent Claim 1, Suzuki et al. does not show, teach or suggest a stator core including stator plates that are stacked in an axial direction. In contrast, the stator core in Suzuki et al. includes stator plates that are stacked in a circumferential direction.

With respect to independent Claim 1, Suzuki et al. does not show, teach or suggest connecting end caps to the stator plates that are located at opposite axial ends of the stator core. In contrast, opposite axial ends of the stator plates in Suzuki et al. extend axially outside of the end caps. The opposite axial end surfaces of the stator core in Suzuki et al. are not connected to end caps.

With respect to dependent Claim 5, the end cap assembly of Suzuki et al is located between the winding wire and the radial side surfaces of the stator core. In Claim 5, the end cap assembly is not located between the winding wire and radial side surfaces of the stator segment core. Therefore, Claim 5 is allowable for this reason as well.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants believe that Claims 1 and 5 are in condition for allowance. Claims 2-14 are directly or indirectly dependent upon Claims 1 and 5 are therefore allowable for the same reasons.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 15-19 and 25-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCoy in view of Trago et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,806,169) and further in view of Barr (U.S. Pat. No. 1,756,672).

With respect to Claims 15 and 25, McCoy, Trago et al. and Barr fail to show, teach or suggest an end cap assembly as claimed for a segmented stator. McCoy shows a circumferentially continuous stator that is not segmented ~ therefore, there are no stator segment assemblies. The Examiner admits that Trago et al. and Barr do not show, teach or suggest an end cap assembly including first and second end caps with a first inner winding retainer section.

The end cap assembly for the non-segmented stator in McCoy is located between the winding wire and the radial side surfaces of the stator core. In particular, the sleeve 32 of the end cap assembly is located between the winding wire and the non-segmented core. As set forth above, Trago et al. and Barr do not include end cap assemblies. In Claims 15 and 25, the end cap assembly is not located between the winding wire and radial side surfaces of the stator segment core.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants believe that Claims 15 and 25 are in allowable form. Claims 16-19 are directly or indirectly dependent upon Claim 15 and are also allowable for the same reasons. Claims 26-28 are directly or indirectly

dependent upon Claim 25 and are also allowable for the same reasons.

Claims 20-24 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over McCoy in view of Trago et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 5,806,169). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

With respect to Claim 20, McCoy and Trago et al. fail to show, teach or suggest an end cap assembly as claimed for a segmented stator. McCoy shows a circumferentially continuous stator that is not segmented ~ therefore, there are no stator segment assemblies. The Examiner admits that Trago et al. does not show, teach or suggest an end cap assembly including first and second end caps with a first inner winding retainer section.

The end cap assembly for the non-segmented stator in McCoy is located between the winding wire and the radial side surfaces of the stator core. In particular, the sleeve 32 is located between the winding wire and the non-segmented core. As set forth above, Trago et al. and Barr do not include end cap assemblies. In Claim 20, the end cap assembly is not located between the winding wire and radial side surfaces of the stator segment core.

For the foregoing reasons, Applicants believe that Claim 20 is in allowable form. Claims 21-24 are directly or indirectly dependent upon Claim 20 and are also allowable for the same reasons.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: May 7, 2003

By: Michael D. Wiggins
Michael D. Wiggins
Reg. No. 34,754

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600